DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 433 CG 022 705

AUTHOR Shulman, Shmuel; Samet, Naomi
TITLE Adolescents' Close Friendship Types and Friendship Reasoning.
PUB DATE Mar 90
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence (3rd, Atlanta, GA, March 22-25, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Classification; Foreign Countries; *Friendship; *Grade 10; High Schools; High School Students; *Individual Characteristics; Prosocial Behavior
IDENTIFIERS Israel

ABSTRACT

Friendships between individuals can be found throughout lifespans. This study examined an interaction between adolescents who consider themselves close friends. Inspection of friends' interaction when working on a joint task may allow the classification of close friendships in adolescence. In addition friends were asked about their joint daily activities to allow the detection of possible characteristics of interaction across friendship types. The study also examined adolescents' conceptions of friendship across various possible types of friendship. Subjects (N=90) included 23 pairs of female and 22 pairs of male Israeli 10th graders who identified themselves as friends. Analysis revealed three main patterns of adolescents' close friendships: interdependent, enmeshed, and disengaged. The three types reflect different qualities of relationships at the dyadic level which transcend the behavior of individuals. In the interdependent type friends were close to each another and they also respected each other's personal views and preferences. In the enmeshed type friends were very close to each another, it was very important to them to act in consensus, and they suppressed individual preferences for a greater sense of closeness and unity. In the disengaged type each partner emphasized individuality and separateness while working on a joint task. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED322433

Adolescents' Close Friendship Types and Friendship Reasoning

Shmuel Shulman and Naomi Samet
Tel-Aviv University

Presented at the Third Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence. March, 1990, Atlanta, GA.

CG 022705

Authors' Address:

School of Education
Tel-Aviv University
69978 Ramat Aviv
Israel

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Shmuel Shulman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Adolescents' Close Friendship Types and Friendship Reasoning

Friendships between individuals can be found throughout the life span. For young children, friendship provides a partner or a playmate with whom time is spent and interesting activities can be pursued (Ginsberg, Gottman & Parker, 1986; Howes, 1981). With age, though common activities continue to reflect an important aspect of friendship; friends are also willing to help each other (Wright, 1984). Willingness to help between friends reflects the closeness of their relationship (Berndt, 1986). The willingness to help is related, according to Youniss (1980), to the individual's recognition that peers are different and each may need the other's help on some occasion. Through the experience of reciprocated help, friends move into mutual understanding. Friends get better acquainted with each others' preferences, opinions and wishes. They learn to solve problems together and to compromise differences. Intimacy is the logical outcome of these developmental steps (Youniss, 1980). Friends allow themselves to be fully open to each other, to disclose personal secrets, and to exchange ideas within a secure and accepting environment. Studies indicated that adolescents emphasize self disclosure, openness and affection as crucial components of their friendships (Berndt, 1986; Bigelow, 1977; Furman & Bierman, 1983; Hunder and Youniss, 1982). Intimate and affective feelings are the hallmark of friendship and distinguish between "common" friends and "close" friends (Oden, Herzberger, Nangoine & Wheeler, 1984). It is

particularly during the earlier years of adolescence that the need for intimacy with a friend emerges (Sullivan (1953) and not until this age are peers perceived as more important companions than parents (Burnmester & Furman, 1987).

A question may be raised as to whether a "close" friendship consists of one clear facet, a relationship where partners report on their intimacy and closeness; or whether there are different types of "close" relationships. Selman (1980) presents a developmental model of friendship. According to Selman two sequential stages of adolescent friendship can be characterized. At the initial stage friendship is characterized by mutual support and understanding where an intimate relationship is maintained. At the latter stage friends are able to balance between the sense of intimacy, closeness to each other and respect for the other's individuality. Following Selman's contention, two types of close friendship during adolescence may be hypothesized. In the first type of relationship, a high level of support and mutual understanding between friends is the focus. In the higher type, intimacy and support between friends is combined with respect for the other's individuality. Friendship has been studied by investigating children's and adolescents' general beliefs about friendship (Bigelow, 1977; Furman & Bierman, 1983; Hunter & Youniss, 1982; Keller & Wood, 1989; Selman, 1980) or in their descriptions of their actual friendships (Berndt, 1986; Burmester & Furman, 1987; Sharabany, Gershoni & Hoffman, 1981). However, a relationship is defined as a series of interactions between two people occurring over time (Hinde, 1979). In friendship studies even when interaction between friends was measured, often the object of observation was the behavior of one or both friends in the relationship.

Relationship on the dyadic or group level has been extensively studied in the field of family systems. Family theorists have emphasized two main dimensions operating in the family system: The emotional relatedness between family members and individual striving for development and independence (Minuchin, 1974; Wynne, 1958). Reiss (1981) formulated a theory on the varieties of family consensual experience, namely the nature of their closeness. On the basis of research, Reiss formulated the main dimensions that characterize family interaction during a joint problem solving task. The first dimension is configuration (problem solving effectiveness), the contribution of the family in enhancing problem solving when the entire family works as a group. The second dimension is coordination referring to the will, determination and capacity of family members to solve problems in a similar manner. Using these dimensions, Reiss suggested a family typology consisting of three main paradigms:

a Environment-sensitive paradigm. When a problem is presented to the family, each member is aware of the need to use and explore all the possible stimuli and information in order to solve the problem. They also make full use of each other as belonging to a group to achieve the best solution. They react to one another objectively and are free to accept or reject solutions of others. The solution is not immediate, but the end of a long process of evaluating all the available information. There is no pressure to accept a particular solution of any member. The information which each member presents is an aid in clarifying the problem and they attempt to reach the optimal solution. The final

solution is a balance of individual perceptions and the contribution of all of the family members in order to achieve the optimal solution.

b. Consensus-sensitive paradigm. In families of this type it is most important for the family to be cohesive and in full agreement with one another. Every member is sensitive to the opinions of the other and does not express ideas that may clash with or hurt another member. In this manner the family strives to reach a quick solution to the problem without disagreements. The best solution is of secondary importance; what is most important for them is to remain united and work cooperatively. The over-emphasis on cohesion prevents them from examining all the facts and presses for a united solution, even if it is not the most effective.

c. Distance-sensitive paradigm. Problem solving in this type of family is perceived as a way for each member to express his/her independence of the others. The acceptance of any other opinion is evidence of weakness. Each member relates to the problem without using any information provided by other family members. Some members work quickly and impulsively, while others methodically examine all the data. In these families the optimal solution takes a secondary place. What is most important for them is that each demonstrate control and independence from the others.

Reiss' family typology is not conceptually different from other family typologies (Olson, Sprenkle & Russel, 1979). The merit of Reiss' approach is that it is experimentally based compared to others which are rather based on clinical experience with families.

Application of these family paradigms would suggest the following possible types of adolescent close friendships. The first type would be a relationship where friends are close to one another: intimacy and self disclosure mark this relationship. However, closeness is not achieved at the expense of each partner's independence. This type recalls the highest level of friendship according to Selman's (1980) theory and parallels Reiss' Environment Sensitive paradigm. The second type would be a friendship where intimacy and closeness between partners is over-emphasized. This may recall Selman's Level 3 friendship and parallels Reiss' Consensus Sensitive paradigm. The third possible type would be a friendship where partners over-emphasize their individuality reflecting Reiss' Distance Sensitive paradigm. Although it does not seem logical to assume the existence of a "close" friendship where partners prefer separateness. However, since such a disengaged type of relationship is found in families, it may be reasonable to look for it among adolescents' friendships as well.

The present paper has two objectives:

First, this study aims to examine an interaction between adolescents who consider themselves close friends. Inspection of friends' interaction when working on a joint task may allow the classification of close friendships in adolescence. In addition, friends will be asked about their joint daily activities to allow the detection of different possible characteristics of interaction across friendship types. The second objective of the study is to examine adolescents' conceptions of friendship across various possible types of friendship. Selman (1980) suggested a hierarchial sequence of friendship reasoning. In addition, levels of friendship reasoning are assessed across

various aspects representing unique features of the friendship concept. These aspects relate to the following issues: motivation for having a close friend, the meaning of trust and jealousy between friends as well as of conflict resolution, and the termination of friendship. Selman has shown friendship reasoning to develop with age (Gurruchari & Selman, 1982; Selman, 1980). Thus, the second question in this study tests whether same age adolescents, representing different types of close friendship, will show different levels of friendship reasoning in general, and in the various aspects of their concept of friendship.

Method

Subjects

Tenth graders (15-year-olds) from a senior high school in a northern suburb of Tel-Aviv, representing students from the lower middle class to the upper middle class spectrum, were included in the study. Home room teachers were asked to identify pairs of same sex close friends in their classes. Subsequently, popular and active students were also asked to identify pairs of close friends. Finally, identified subjects were individually interviewed about their having a close friend. Pairs of reciprocated close friendships were included in the study. Following this procedure, 45 pairs of close friends (23 pairs of girls and 22 pairs of boys) were included in the study.

Procedure, Instruments and Scoring

Pairs of close friends were jointly given the Reiss Card Procedure and were individually interviewed concerning their joint activities. The Selman

(1980) Friendship Interview was also individually administered. In half of the cases the joint problem solving task was administered before individuals were interviewed. In the other half the procedure was reversed.

The Reiss Card-Sort, Problem Solving Procedure. The problem-solving procedure which is reported in detail by Reiss (1981) was given to both friends. This procedure consists of a set of cards that show a row of letters of varying order and length. Subjects are told to sort the cards in any way they wish and in as many piles as they choose, up to seven. Cards can be sorted according to a pattern system or according to a variant of a length system. The task is divided into two phases. First, friends sort the cards individually without speaking to each other. Second, friends are permitted to talk to and to consult with one another while sorting the cards, but are not instructed whether or not they are to reach agreement. They sort two cards at a time and the tester permits them to go on to the next two cards after both are finished. The possible patterns for each of the two phases are similar in form, but not identical.

The dimensions postulated by Reiss to characterize family interaction are represented by four measures of family behavior, produced by objective recording during the procedure. The configuration dimension is represented by two measures which indicate the pair's effectiveness in solving the card-sort problem: in the individual sort and the joint sort (INIT COMPLEXITY) (JNT COMPLEXITY). The inter-friend sort similarity measure (SORT SIM) and the standard deviation of members' trial ending times (TIME SD) constitute the coordination dimension. (A low TIME SD reflects friends' tendency to finish each trial together). This procedure has been

used in the past with families, groups and parents, and made it possible to identify clearly types of families.

Daily Activities Interview. Individuals were asked to describe their common activities with their close friends. They were asked about type, frequency and location of their meetings and activities. Also, they were asked to describe how often they meet in dyads, with the close friend, or in a group. Their closeness was verified by questions like whether they sleep at each other's homes, swap clothing or touch each other in playful activities.

Friendship Conceptions Interview: Subjects were given Selman's (1980) hypothetical friendship dilemma. The written dilemma was presented and subjects were instructed end encouraged to write down their opinions in detail. The issues explored were (1) Motivation: "Friendship is important to me because..." (2) Trust: "Trust between friends means ..." (3) Jealousy: "If Dan will be jealous of Gad because of his interaction with Eitan it will cause their friendship to ..." (4) Conflict: "Sometimes conflicts occur between friends because ..." and (5) Termination of Friendship: "A close friendship term-inates when...". Adolescents' answers were scored by two raters according to a scoring manual by Selman and Jaquette (1977).

Stability of Friendship. Three months after this interview, subjects were contacted by phone and were asked about the identity of their best friend in order find out about friendships that had terminated.

Results

Pairs' performance on the Reiss Card Sort Procedure was computed. According to criteria suggested by Reiss (1981) pairs were classified and three friendship types emerged. Twenty six of the 45 pairs revealed a high level of configuration and coordination. This resembles Reiss' environment sensitive family type and was termed Interdependent Friendship. Ten pairs were low on configuration and high on coordination, resembling Reiss' consensus sensitive type. This type was termed Enmeshed Friendship. The last 9 pairs were low on configuration and low on coordination. These pairs resemble Reiss' distance sensitive family and were termed Disengaged Friendship. Means and standard deviations on the four card sort measures across friendship types are shown in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Pairs of boys and girls were almost equally distributed across friendship types.

Daily Activities across Friendship Types:

Interviews revealed similar activities to characterize friends' behavior across friendship types. Friends meet 2-3 times per week after school. They speak on the phone at least once a day. They meet either at one of the

friends' home or somewhere outside home. They go together to the beach, to a movie, or to parties. Friends also study together. It is not very common to sleep over at a friend's home but it is quite common to exchange educational material, items of clothing or records. However, when asked whether the two friends go out by themselves or in a large group, a clear distinction among friends from the three friendship types emerged. As can be seen in Table 2, pairs of the Interdependent Type go out in dyads as well

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

as in groups. Adolescents in Enmeshed pairs show a higher tendency to go out in groups whereas adolescents of Disengaged pairs show a higher tendency for going out as a dyad. No play-fight behavior was found among girls. However, boys of both the Enmeshed and Disengaged types reported a low incidence of rough and tumble play. When reporting they tended to add that their fights were not serious. Boys of the Interdependent type openly reported on rough and tumble play.

Friendship Reasoning:

Adolescents' written answers on the Selman Friendship Reasoning interview was analyzed by two raters. Due to the nature of the written answers it was not possible to rate adolescents' level on the different friendship issues according to Selman's scoring system. Therefore, the analysis was

conducted in two modes. First, each adolescent's comprehensive written answers were rated according to Selman's scoring system. Reliability between two raters was .87. Adolescents' level of friendship reasoning of the Interdependent type was 2.53. The friendship level of the Enmeshed type was 2.40 and of the Disengaged type 2.22, $F(2.87) = 2.69$, $p = .07$. As can be seen, adolescents of the Interdependent type reveal the highest level of friendship reasoning while adolescents of the Disengaged type reveal the lowest. Adolescents of the Enmeshed type are mid-range on their level of friendship reasoning. The difference between the two extremes of the Interdependent and the Disengaged is significant ($t = 2.43$ $p<.05$). The second mode of analysis was conducted following Youniss' (1980, p. 192) method. Adolescents' reasoning responses on the five friendship issues were content-analyzed and distribution of the various categories across the three friendship types was tallied. As can be seen in four out of five friendship issues, adolescents of different friendship types exhibit different reasons for friendship. Disengaged adolescents' motivation for a close friend-

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

ship is mainly aimed at preventing loneliness and having an intimate relationship, they do not emphasize mutual help. As Table 3 shows, adolescents of the Enmeshed type raise all four reasons for having a friend. Reasons of adolescents of the Interdependent type for having a close friend are: joint activities, help/support and intimacy. These adolescents do not show the tendency to look for a friend out of the fear of loneliness.

Trust was similarly perceived by adolescents across friendship types. Adolescents mainly describe "trust" as mutual support and sharing of secrets. Jealousy was generally perceived to effect either separation between close friends, or change/development of the friendship. Adolescents of the Disengaged type tend to perceive jealousy as a reason for separation. Adolescents of the Interdependent type show a tendency to perceive jealousy as a reason for re-evaluation of the relationship with a chance for change or development. Differing opinions are a reason for a fight between Disengaged friends. Interdependent friends accept differing opinions and only when an issue of trust is questioned a fight between friends may occur.

Three reasons for termination of a friendship were raised by adolescents across friendship types: a fight between friends, mistrust, or when persons start to change, for instance when a third person (a boy/girl friend) enters. Disengaged adolescents tend to perceive a fight as the main reason for termination of friendship and hardly mention change or development as a cause in the end of a relationship. Enmeshed adolescents hardly mention fights, according to their perception mistrust may be the main reason for termination of a friendship. Interdependent adolescents explicitly raise the three various reasons for termination of a friendship but they emphasize change/development more than expected.

Thus, it can be summarized that adolescents of the various types of close friendship raise different reasons for the motivation for having a friend, differently describe dynamics of friendship processes, and emphasize different reasons for termination of a friendship.

Stability of Friendship Types:

Three months following their first interview and testing, adolescents were reached by telephone. Adolescents were asked to report on the state of their friendship. As can be seen in Table 4, the majority of friendships (75

Insert Table 4 about here

---

percent) are stable over a period of three months. However, Enmeshed pairs show a significant tendency (45 percent) to resolve their friendship. Interdependent pairs on the other hand show a greater than expected tendency (85 percent) to have a stable relationship.

Discussion

In this study three main patterns of adolescents' close friendships were found: Interdependent, Enmeshed and Disengaged. The three types reflect different qualities of relationships at the dyadic level which transcend the behavior of individuals. In the Interdependent type, friends are close to one another and they also respect each other's personal views and preferences. As shown in their friendship reasoning, Interdependent adolescents are capable of solving misunderstandings and conflicts in such a way that their friendship is re-evaluated and in the long run, individual opinions contribute to the quality of the friendship and strengthens it. In the Enmeshed type,

friends are very close to one another. It is very important for them to act in consensus and they suppress individual preferences for a greater sense of closeness and unity. In the Disengaged pair, each partner emphasizes his/her own individuality and separateness from the other while working on a joint task. These adolescents probably cannot tolerate differing opinions. Disagreement may cause a fight between the two Disengaged friends (as expressed in their friendship reasoning) which in turn may lead to termination of the friendship.

The three types of friendship correspond to the well known patterns found among families by researchers and clinicians (Constantine, 1987; Minuchin, 1974; Olson, Sprenkle and Russel, 1970; Reiss, 1981; Wynne, 1958): The Environment Sensitive (Reiss) - Clear Boundaries (Minuchin); the Consensus Sensitive (Reiss) - Enmeshed (Minuchin), and the Distance Sensitive (Reiss) - Disengaged (Minuchin) family types. Inspection of friendship reasoning may further highlight the dynamics of friendship in adolescence and across types. As can be seen (Table 3) adolescents across types emphasize intimacy as a reason for having a close friend. The need for intimacy probably reflects the transition to adolescence in general. (Berndt, 1985; Bukowski, Newcomb & Hoza, 1987; Sullivan, 1953). It is the dilemma of how to coordinate between intimacy, daily activities and supporting and helping one another that differentiates between friendship types. Interdependent friends are not afraid that rough and tumble play between themselves will escalate into a fight. Also, they are comfortable going out within a larger group of friends and probably do not think that being in a larger group may create distance between the two close friends. Thus, Interdependent friends know how to integrate intimacy with ongoing activities.

Enmeshed friends also try to integrate the various activities with their growing need for intimacy. Their tendency for closeness fits with the developmental trend since adolescents display a strong preference for equality over competition with friends (Berndt, 1985). In order to strengthen their friendship, they try to refrain from conflicts and they do not consider a fight - a conflict - as a possible cause for resolution of a friendship: From their perspective a sense of mistrust or jealousy is rather considered as a strain on their closeness that may terminate friendship.

Disengaged adolescents look for a close friend in order to assuage each others' loneliness and fulfil the need for intimacy. However, they probably have a great fear of losing the close friend. Therefore, these adolescents employ different strategies to avoid any stress on the relationship. They prefer to go out in a dyad and not in a larger group, so that the sense of friendship is optionally and continuously maintained. However, they keep a certain distance to avoid differing opinions and conflicts which according to their reasoning may lead to termination of the friendship. Disengaged friends paradoxically prefer being "distant" in order to preserve their friendship-closeness.

Conceptually, the types of close friendships found in this study recall some of Karpel's (1976) modes of relationships. The Interdependent type of friendship is similar to Karpel's Dialogue which represents the mature stage of a relationship. In this type of relationship the poles of "I" and "We" are integrated in such a way that they nourish and foster one another. Individuation (the differentiated "I") and dialogue (the differentiated "We")

are complementary parts of the overall process of both partners' simultaneous self-delineation in the relationship. The more highly individuated the partners, the better prepared they are for a dialogic relationship (Karpel, 1976; p. 77,78). The Enmeshed and Disengaged types may represent a transitional relational mode. In the Enmeshed type the search is for a "soul mate", and partners move toward one another until a degree of fusion is reached. However, as Karpel suggests, fusion is threatening to both partners which in turn may lead to separation. It may be recalled that the Enmeshed type was the least stable of the three types of friendships. Forty five percent of those pairs of friends were resolved during a following 3 month period. In the Disengaged type partners "maintain contact without fusion by establishing a pattern in which one partner keeps up a facade of distance, while the other pursues" (p. 74). This type of interaction, as described by Karpel, was clearly observed when Disengaged adolescents worked on the joint task. Usually one partner tried to initiate a consultation with his/her friend while the other insisted on working separately.

Developmentally, the Interdependent type of friendship reflects the highest level (Level 4) of friendship conception (Selman, 1980) as individuals understand that they rely on each other for support and for intimacy. Nonetheless, they retain their individuality within the friendship. Enmeshed friendships consist of mutual support and understanding which also represents a high level of friendship reasoning (Level 3), however the over emphasis on intimacy may lead to a possessive relationship which in turn may interfere with individuation which is an important task in adolescence (Blos 1969/1979). The adolescent trades off dependency upon a parent against dependency upon a friend. Disengaged adolescents are able

to understand the meaning of cooperation, trust and intimacy. Nevertheless, the emergence of differing views and conflicts are considered as terminating the friendship (Level 2). For this reason, these adolescents establish patterns of interaction with a low chance of conflict. Partners are distant though they have a sense of closeness.

Adolescents in this study were similar in age and in social background, to that individual differences in friendship reasoning cannot be attributed to these variables (Pellegrini 1986; Selman, 1980). We should like to consider another possible source for individual differences in friendship type membership and level of friendship reasoning.

The friendship paradigms found in this study recall the attachment typology (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978), where the securely attached infants (B-type) are able to balance between their proximity and contact to the mother, and their exploration of the novel environment. Closeness and individual interest are integrated. In the infants showing resistant attachment (C-type) the wish for proximity exists but the infant is not sure how close he/she may approach the mother. Infants showing an avoidant atachment (A-type) have probably learned that the most adaptive mode of maintaining a relationship with the mother is being apart.

In a study by Shulman, Elicker and Sroufe (1989), close friendships developed by pre-adolescents with different attachment histories were followed for a period of 4 weeks during a summer camp. In-depth case studies revealed that partners with a history of *secure attachment* to their initial caregiver developed highly interdependent relationships with

friends. In their relationships, they were able to establish a balance between competent mastery of the environment, and closeness and intimacy to the other. In the case of a pair with a history of *resistant attachment*, partners developed what may be termed a "sporadic friendship" (Howes, 1973). Two boys revealed a real concern for one another, however this closeness was not sustained. Their friendship would "fade away" without reason and would later resume as if no break had occurred. Pre-dolescents with *avoidant attachment* history were socially incompetent. Nonetheless, one pair of girls with A-type attachment history developed a very close friendship, without any ability to explore the relationship which was almost a "pure fusion" (Karpel, 1986). Thus, it may be assumed that the basic pattern of the early relationship with the initial caregiver (mother) is carried over into an intimate relationship with a peer in adolescence (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986).

Suggestions offered in the Shulman, Elicker and Sroufe (1989) study are mostly based on in-depth case studies. Park and Waters (1989) observed pairs of pre-school children and their best friends. Attachment history of the pre-schoolers was evaluated by interviewing their mothers. Park and Waters found mostly two possible kinds of association of friends when their attachment history was evaluated: secure-secure pairs and secure-insecure pairs. The secure-secure pairs did not engage in less conflict compared to the secure-insecure pairs but used more strategies that reflected fair settlement and negotiation. Hence again, it is demonstrated that a secure attachment history is positively related to the ability to establish an optionally negotiable friendship: a relationship in which the need of the other is respected. Elicker (1989) reported that children with secure

attachment and resistant attachment histories showed higher levels of interpersonal sensitivity than those with avoidant attachment histories.

Types of friendship were found to relate to different friendship reasoning. Primarily it may be suggested that heterogeneity in reasoning about friendship (Pelligrini 1986) is related to the establishment of a different type of close friendship. However, from a broader developmental perspective, emphasizing continuity, it may be argued that different earlier patterns of relationships are carried forward (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986) and are expressed in the type of friendship established and in the level of friendship reasoning. Future studies, in which earlier relationships of adolescents are known, or where their attachment is evaluated may further highlight the question of who establishes what type of close friendship in adolescence.

Finally, close friendships in this study were evaluated from a dyadic, systemic perspective and family terms were applied to relationships between friends. Application of family systemic approaches may contribute to a further understanding of friendship processes in adolescence.

References

Ainsworth, M.D.S., Blehar, M., Waters, E. & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Berndt, T.J. (1983). Social cognition, social behavior, and children's friendship. In E.T. Higgins, D.N. Rubbe & W.W. Hartup (Eds.), *Social cognition and social development* (pp. 158-189). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Berndt, T.J. (1986). Sharing between friends: Context and consequences. In E.C. Mueller & C.R. Cooper (Eds.), *Process and outcome in peer relationships* (pp. 105-128). New York: Academic Press.

Biglow, B.J. (1979). Children's friendship expectations: A cognitive developmental study. *Child Development, 48,* 247-253.

Blos, P. (1967/1979). The second individuation process of adolescence. In P. Blos, *The adolescent passage: Developmental issues.* New York: International Press.

Bukowski, W.M., Newcomb, A.F. & Hoza, B. (1987). Friendship conceptions among early adolescents: A longitudinal study of stability and change. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 7,* 143-152.

Burnmester, D. & Furman, W. (1987). The development of companionship and intimacy. *Child Development, 58,* 11-3-1113.

Constantine, L.L. (1987). Adolescence process and family organization: A model of development as a function of family paradigm. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 2,* 349-366.

Elicker, J. (April 1989). The role of attachment history in the understanding of peer relations in middle childhood. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development. Kansas City, NO.

Furman, W. & Bierman, K.L. (1983). Developmental changes in young children's conceptions of friendship. *Child Development, 54,* 549-556.

Ginsberg, D., Gottman, J.M. & Parker, J.G. (1986). The importance of friendship. In J.M. Gottman, and J.G. Parker (Eds.), *Conversations of friends.* (pp. 3-78) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gurruchari, C. & Selman, R.L. (1982). The development of interpersonal understanding during childhood, preadolescence and adolescence: A longitudinal follow-up study. *Child Development, 53,* 924-927.

Hinde, R.A. (1979). *Towards understanding relationships.* London: Academic Press.

Hunter, F.T. & Youniss, J. (1982). Changes in functions of three relations during adolescence. *Developmental Psychology, 18,* 806-811.

Howes, C. (1981, April). Patterns of friendship. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Boston.

Howes, C. (1983). Patterns of friendship. *Child Development, 54,* 1041-1053.

Karpel, M. (1976). Individuation: From fusion to dialogue. *Family Process, 15,* 65-82.

Keller, N. & Wood, P. (1989). Development of friendship reasoning: A study of interdividual differences in intra-individual change. *Developmental Psychology, 25,* 820-826.

Minuchin, S. (1974). *Family and family therapy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Oden, S., Hertzberger, S.D., Mangaine, P.L. & Wheeler, V.A. (1984). Children's peer-relationship: An examination of social processes. In: J.C. Mastes and K. Yarkin-Levin (Eds.). *Boundary areas in social and developmental psychology.* New York: Academic Press.

Olson, D.H., Sprenkle, D. & Russel, C. (1979). Circumplex model of marital and family systems I. Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types and clinical application. *Family Process, 18,* 3-28.

Park, K.A. & Waters, E. (1989). Security of attachment and preschool friendships. *Child Development, 60,* 1076-1081.

Pellegrini, D.S. (1986). Variability in children's level of reasoning about friendship. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 7,* 341-354.

Reiss, D. (1981). *The family's construction of reality.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Selman, R. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding: Clinical and developmental analysis.* New York: Academic Press.

Sellman, R.L. & Jacquette, D. (1977). Stability and oscillation in interpersonal awareness: A clinical developmental analysis. In: C.B. Keasey (Ed.). *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 25, pp. 261-304) Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Sharabany, R., Gershoni, R. & Hofman, J. (1981). Girlfriend, boyfriend: Age and sex differences in intimate friendship. *Development Psychology, 17*, 800-808.

Shulman, S., Elicker, J. & Sroufe, L.L. (1989). Stages of friendship growth in preadolescence as related to attachment history. Article submitted for publication.

Sroufe, L.A. & Fleeson, J. (1986). Attachment and the construction of relationships. In: W.W. Hartup & Z. Rubin (Eds.), *Relationships and development* (pp. 51-71). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sullivan, H.S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry.* New York: Norton.

Wright, P.H. (1984). Self-referant motivation and the intrinsic quality of friendship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 1*, 115-130.

Wynne, L.C. (1958). Pseudomutuality in the families of schizophrenics. *Psychiatry, 21*, 205-250.

Youniss, J. (1980). *Parents and peers in social development.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Table 1: Card-Sort Measures Across the Three Friendship Types

	Interdependent n* = 26		Enmeshed n = 10		Disengaged n = 9	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Configuration						
INITIAL COMPLEXITY	0.846	0.131	0.824	0.079	0.803	0.093
JOINT COMPLEXITY	0.879	0.107	0.725	0.150	0.834	0.122
Coordination						
SORT SIMILARITY	0.996	0.016	0.949	0.096	0.548	0.229
TIME SD	1.575	2.451	1.436	2.467	5.589	4.227

n* = number of pairs

Table 2: Actual Interactions Across Types of Friendship

	Types of Friendship				
	Interdependent n = 52	Enmeshed n = 20	Disengaged n = 18	Total	
How do you go out?					
Mostly the two of us, by ourselves	26(25)*	8(13)	14(10)	48	$x^2 = 9.24$
In a group with more friends	18(19)	14(9)	3(7)	35	df =2
					p<.001
Do you play-fight?					
rough and tumble play -					
(only for males)					
Never, if we do it, it is not serious	13(15)	7(6)	5(4)	25	$x^2 = 5.90^a$
					df = 1
Yes, we play fight	10(8)	1(2)	2(3)	13	p< .02

a - because of low expected frequencies of play-fight, the Enmeshed and Disengaged types were collapsed and a 2 x 2 x^2 test was computed.

* Expected frequencies, rounded

Table 3: Aspects of Close Friendships Across Three Types of Friendship

	Types of Friendship				
	Interdependent n = 52	Enmeshed n = 20	Disengaged n = 18	Total	
Friendship is important for					
Not being lonely	8(13)*	3(5)	12(5)	23	
Joint activities	10(9)	4(3)	2(3)	16	$x^2 = 17.22$ df = 6
Help, support	25(21)	8(8)	4(8)	37	
Intimacy	27(27)	10(10)	10(10)	47	p<.01
What can jealousy do to a friendship?					
Separation	15(19)	8(7)	8(5)	31	$x^2 = 4.95$ df = 2
Change/development	44(40)	12(14)	7(10)	63	p<.08
What are the reasons for a fight between friends?					
Differing opinions, ideas	14(19)	8(7)	10(6)	32	$x^2 = 6.46$ df = 2
Misunderstanding, change in trust, jealousy	39(34)	10(11)	7(11)	50	p<.05
What may end a friendship?					
A fight	15(15)	2(6)	8(4)	25	$x^2 = 9.76$
Mistrust, jealousy	26(30)	13(10)	7(8)	46	df = 4
Change, development, third person	23(20)	8(7.5)	2(5.5)	33	p<.05

* Expected frequencies; rounded

Table 4: Four Months Follow-up of Close Firendships

	Interdependent	Enmeshed	Disengaged	Total	
Terminated; Major changes	7(12)*	9(5)	5(4)	21	$x^2 = 7.37$
					df = 2
stable	40(35)	11(15)	11(12)	62	
					$p < .03$

* Expected frequencies, rounded